

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 675

HE 018 603

AUTHOR McClintock, Charles
TITLE Information Management in Educational Organizations:
Assessing Administrators' Information Needs. AIR 1985
Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the
Association for Institutional Research (25th,
Portland, OR, April 28-May 1, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Administrators; *College
Administration; *Decision Making; Higher Education;
Human Resources; *Information Needs; *Information
Sources; Management Information Systems; Program
Administration; *Program Development; Program
Evaluation; State Surveys; Statistical Data;
Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

Factors related to the contextual aspects of educational administrators' information needs were studied in a statewide survey of 199 administrators of adult and community education programs. Attention was directed to: varying preferences for different information sources, the effects of different decision or program development tasks on preferences for information sources, demand for accountability, and program uncertainties. The verbal information sources included discussion with agency clients (internal) and government officials (external). Administrators generally found information from verbal sources more useful for program development than information from analytic sources (e.g., surveys, structured program evaluations). Analytic information was most useful to administrators when demands for accountability and program certainty were at high levels. Administrators did not see the value of analytic information for tasks such as resource allocation, program design, and monitoring. It is suggested that the problem may be that analytic information is too costly or unwieldy. Future research should focus on methods that link the compensatory strengths of verbal and analytic sources of information in the design of information systems. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED259675

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Information Management in Educational Organizations:
Assessing Administrators' Information Needs

Charles McClintock
College of Human Ecology
Cornell University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional
Research, April 1985, in Portland, Oregon. For further information contact the
author at College of Human Ecology, MVR-N116, Cornell University, Ithaca, New
York 14853; (607) 256-2061.



This paper was presented at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Portland Hilton in Portland, Oregon, April 28-May 1, 1985. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum papers.

Elizabeth F. Fox, Chair
Forum Publications Editorial
Advisory Committee

Abstract

This research investigated several factors related to the contextual aspects of educational administrators' information needs. In a statewide survey of 119 administrators the following issues were studied: (1) varying preferences for different information sources; and the effects on preferences for information sources of (2) different decision or program development tasks, (3) demands for accountability and (4) program uncertainties. Major findings were that administrators generally found information from verbal sources (e.g., conversations with clients) more useful for program development than information from analytic sources (e.g., surveys). Analytic information was most useful to administrators when demands for accountability and program certainty were at high levels. Future research should focus on methods that link the compensatory strengths of verbal and analytic sources of information in the design of information systems.

Information Management in Educational Organizations:
Assessing Administrators' Information Needs

Metaphors are important to an understanding of administrative behavior and they have been applied in thought provoking ways to the study of educational organizations. Among the most common and heuristic metaphors are loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976), organized anarchies (March & Olsen, 1976) and garbage cans (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972). These descriptors, as well as others grounded in behavioral observation (Boyd & Crowson, 1981; Martin & Willower, 1981), convey an image of the educational administrator as a broker among multiple, autonomous, and often adversarial constituencies inside and outside the organization's boundaries.

While administrators may be brokers for many things including power, goals, resources, structural arrangements and personnel decisions, the common medium of their work is information. For example, Whetten (1984), in a challenge to profit sector chauvinists who argue that a school ought to be run like a business, describes several of the information brokering demands on the educational administrator. Effective educational administration requires attention to (1) coalition building in which the needs and interests of all groups are continually assessed, (2) dissemination of new ideas and opportunities, (3) personification of institutional image, (4) interpreting the quantitative results of planning and evaluation in a visionary manner, and (5) "over-communicating" by maintaining two-way information flow especially in times of stress or retrenchment. The common denominators of these tasks are gathering, processing, interpreting and disseminating information.

Managing information to satisfy the information needs of various internal and external groups is a major administrative responsibility in maintaining organizational effectiveness (Galbraith, 1973; Fincher, 1983). Daft and Lengel (1984), for instance, identify two information management tasks that are

important adjuncts of effectiveness: giving clarity to equivocal information from the environment (for example, interpreting the need and political support for programs), and ensuring adequate information flows for internal coordination and communication.

Given the complexity of information production, analysis and dissemination, it is the job of the institutional researcher to provide staff support to administrators for the information management task. This responsibility requires knowledge of the information needs of administrators, especially as they are related to a variety of decision and brokering demands (McClintock, 1984; Tetlow, 1983). While information need is obviously based on specific content, the usefulness of information is also largely a function of general contextual factors such as information source, decision requirements and program uncertainties.

The institutional researcher collaborates with various administrators in managing information about a wide range of issues from tuition and faculty salaries to facilities planning and admissions. Given that administrators' information needs will always be a function of the particular setting or issue at hand, it would be helpful to identify those contextual aspects of information need that might be generalizable across programs and administrative roles. In this way the institutional researcher can anticipate information needs across situations and manage information more effectively.

Clarifying Administrator Information Needs

The literature suggests four contextual issues that require empirical attention: (1) how administrators' preferences for different information sources vary; and the effects on these preferences of (2) different decision or program development tasks, (3) demands for accountability, and (4) program uncertainties.

Information Sources. Behavioral observation of administrators shows that they exchange and process information across many short episodes of interaction (Mintzberg, 1973). Because of these role demands administrators appear to prefer information that is "live," accessible, and oral (O'Reilly, 1982; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981).

On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that administrators often prefer information in analytic and quantitative form in order to be responsive to external demands for accountability. For example, Feldman and March (1981) argue that administrators operate under normative pressures that require the appearance of accountable and rational decision making. These pressures lead them to commission large amounts of scientifically credible information without much thought about its utility for decision making or program improvement.

These two kinds of information sources, verbal and analytic are both useful to administrators, yet it is not clear which is more preferred. The bulk of the evidence suggests that administrative role demands lead to a preference for verbal sources of information.

Hypothesis 1: For purposes of program development, administrators perceive verbal sources of information as more useful than analytic sources of information.

Another major distinction between sources of information is whether they are internal (e.g. credit hour production) or external (e.g. future sources of funding) to the organization's boundaries. Daft and Lengel (1984) maintain that both sources are significantly related to effectiveness. External information is important when administrators are expected to occupy boundary spanning roles and to monitor environmental threats and opportunities, while internal information is necessary for the administrative tasks of maintaining social cohesion and coordination within the organization.

Hypothesis 2. Administrators perceive external and internal sources of information as being equally useful.

Decision Task. Literature on information needs and preferences typically does not distinguish among the different uses for information. Three types of use have been identified in the literature (Leviton & Hughes, 1981): instrumental use which is action oriented and focuses on short term issues of program design and problem solving; conceptual use which has a more indirect educational value and where the effects are broad and, in Weiss's (1979) terms, more like enlightenment; and symbolic or persuasive use where the focus is primarily political and the objective is to defend or attack programs or policies.

Given varieties of use, how can information needs be more selectively defined in relation to program development or decision tasks? Beyer and Trice (1982) identify two phases in program development decisions which are relevant to the problem of identifying information needs: decisions related to program adoption and program implementation decisions. Each phase implies a different set of information needs. For example, in the adoption phase there is a need for sensing and search behaviors that will yield information about program alternatives and points of view. Argyris and Schon (1977) describe this process as a critical component of organizational learning and suggest that it is necessary to produce information that allows one to question the assumptions that underlie the program's purposes and methods of operation.

In the implementation phase of utilization information needs might be more routine. Evaluation and feedback become important during this phase as a means of monitoring the implementation of choices that have been adopted. This suggests that routinely gathered information is needed for purposes of external accountability or internal control.

A more differentiated approach for linking information needs with decisions is found in the CIPP model of program evaluation (Stufflebeam, 1973). Information needs are tied to four program development or decision tasks. The following kinds of information can be gathered about each decision task:

- (1) Program context - information related to the needs and characteristics of various stakeholders who will consume services or otherwise affect the program.
- (2) Program inputs - information pertaining to the necessary resources, constraints, and feasible activities that might be related to program design.
- (3) Program processes - information that monitors day-to-day implementation of programs such as activities, use of services, resource expenditure, staff efforts.
- (4) Program products - information that assesses outcomes and helps determine a program's worth, modifications or termination.

Program context and product decisions are typically more visible and affected by information from external sources than decisions about program inputs or processes. Analytic information is also most likely to be useful for assessing program context and products since it provides a more defensible basis for decision making in these public domain areas.

Hypothesis 3: Verbal-external and analytic sources of information will be perceived as more useful for context and product decisions than for input or process decisions.

Hypothesis 4: Verbal-internal sources of information will be perceived as more useful for input and process decisions than for context or product decisions.

Accountability Demands. The demands on administrators to appear accountable and rational often lead to a preference for analytic information sources, regardless of the usefulness of the information for actual decision making (Feldman & March, 1981; Maynard-Moody & McClintock, 1981). Others have shown that educational administrators see quantitative sources of information about

program performance as more useful for those who judge accountability (Sproull & Zubrow, 1981). Accountability pressures are often most critical around issues of assessing program needs and performance since these are the more visible phases of program development.

Hypothesis 5a: As accountability demands increase the perceived usefulness of analytic information sources will increase; and

Hypothesis 5b: this effect will be greater for context and product decisions than for input and process decisions.

Uncertainty. It is often argued that as uncertainty about programs increases the need for information also increases (Tushman & Nadler, 1978). This conclusion needs to be qualified, however, by the source of information. Previous research suggests that the usefulness of analytic information is greater when program conditions are certain than when uncertain (Henderson & Nutt, 1978). The reason for this is that analytic information is not helpful for understanding programs whose goals and operations are ambiguous or unpredictable. By similar reasoning one would expect verbal information sources to be more useful when program conditions are uncertain.

Hypothesis 6a: As program uncertainty increases there will be a decrease in the perceived usefulness of analytic information sources; and

Hypothesis 6b: As program uncertainty increases there will be an increase in the perceived usefulness of verbal information sources.

Method

A self-administered questionnaire was mailed to all state and county administrators from selected program areas in a statewide organization for adult and community education.¹ Useable questionnaires were returned by 119 respondents. This number represented an 86% response rate based on the number

of returned questionnaires divided by the number of eligible respondents in the population.

State and local level respondents were experienced administrators with an average tenure with the agency for an average of 22 and 7 years respectively, and in their present roles for an average of 7.5 and 5 years. This experience among respondents strengthens generalizations to other administrator populations. On the other hand, all data were collected from one organization, and the results should be generalized with caution to agencies with different missions and structures.

Measurement of the variables for testing hypotheses was conducted in the following manner:

Information sources - respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of 12 information sources on a 5-point Likert scale (from 1, not useful to 5, very useful). The information items represented eight verbal sources, such as discussions with agency clients (internal) and government officials (external), and four analytic sources such as surveys and structured program evaluations. As discussed below, each source was rated for four decision tasks. Decision task - The previously described rating of the usefulness of information sources was done across each of four decision tasks: assessing client needs (context), determining program resources and activities (inputs), managing programs (processes), and assessing program outcomes (products).

Accountability demand - Respondents were asked to rate their level of need for information to meet federal, state and local government reporting requirements on a 5-point Likert scale.

Uncertainty - Respondents were asked to agree or disagree on a 5-point Likert scale with several statements about the uncertainty related to program design and operations.²

Results

The means for the three information sources broken down by decision task are shown in Figure 1. F-test results and specific comparisons between means are shown in Table 1. The results on overall usefulness in Table 1 support hypothesis 1 since verbal sources were seen as significantly more useful than analytic sources. Internal information sources were rated as more useful for program development than external sources, thus hypothesis 2 is not supported.

[Put Figure 1 and Table 1 here.]

The F test results in Table 1 show that there were significant differences for each information source across the four decision tasks. All but one predicted difference across specific decision tasks were significant; the mean usefulness for verbal-internal information sources on product decisions was higher than expected. In general, when administrators were making public decisions such as assessing needs or evaluating program effects, they preferred information from analytic and verbal-external sources. Thus, hypothesis 3 is supported and hypothesis 4 receives support on three of the four predicted comparisons.

The effects of accountability demands on the usefulness of analytic information sources were significant ($\bar{X}$ for high accountability = 3.6; $\bar{X}$ for low accountability = 3.1; $t = 3.15$, $p < .01$). The usefulness ratings for analytic information sources under high and low accountability and across decision task are shown in Figure 2. All differences are of equal magnitude and are statistically significant ($p < .01$ using t tests). These results support hypothesis 5a but do not support hypothesis 5b. While the mean usefulness for analytic sources is highest in context and product decisions, the effects of accountability demands are equally great in all decision tasks.

[Put Figure 2 here]

The effects of uncertainty on the usefulness of information sources are shown in Table 2. All information sources were perceived as more useful for certain than uncertain program conditions, though this difference only reached significance for analytic sources. This supports hypothesis 6a but not hypothesis 6b.

[Put Table 2 here]

Discussion

Several major patterns emerge from the analysis. First, it is clear that administrators prefer verbal over analytic information sources when one examines all program development decision tasks together. Even in the product assessment task, where structured program evaluation is most likely to be appropriate, verbal sources of information are as useful as analytic sources.

It is worth noting, as predicted, that the means for analytic sources are highest on the context (e.g. needs assessment) and product (e.g. program evaluation) tasks. This finding supports the view that analytic information has symbolic value, since it is seen as more useful in those publicly visible tasks where it signals to others that decision making is being supported with rational scientific methods (Feldman & March, 1981).

At the same time, it is not surprising that administrators find verbal sources of information as useful as analytic sources for tasks such as needs assessment and program evaluation. Obviously there are significantly greater costs to acquiring analytic information, and cost factors are known to weigh heavily on information acquisition (Arrow, 1974). In fact, viewing the cup as half-full, one might say that it is interesting to note how high the means are for analytic sources.

A second consistent pattern concerns the U-shaped distribution of information source means across decision tasks (except for verbal-internal sources on

context decisions). This pattern represents the "black box" image of program management in which decisions about inputs, such as resource allocations, and processes, such as how programs are implemented, are loosely coupled to information use. This is especially the case for the usefulness of analytic information on process decisions as shown in Figure 1. Possibly analytic sources such as computer-based program monitoring systems are not viewed as useful or cost-effective methods for program development decisions. This situation clearly represents a challenge for institutional researchers to develop information systems that can be used to monitor program implementation.

The effects of accountability demand were generally as expected except that the increased usefulness of analytic information was similar in size across decision tasks. Despite the lack of support for hypothesis 5b, the results for accountability highlight the importance of the symbolic uses of information. When administrators are expected to demonstrate accountability they find that analytic information sources are much more useful to them. Again, this finding supports the view that administrators use analytic information as a signal to others that they are managing programs in a rational and responsible manner (Feldman & March, 1981).

The effects of uncertainty on the usefulness of information were not clear. As predicted, analytic information sources were more useful when program conditions were certain, i.e., understood and predictable. Although the differences were not significant, verbal information sources were also seen as more useful under conditions of program certainty — the opposite of what was predicted. The pattern of results suggests that information from all sources was less useful when program conditions were uncertain, which is contrary to intuition and previous research findings.

One explanation for the uncertainty effects on verbal information sources may be a construct validity problem. The measures reported in this analysis focused on uncertainty related to program inputs and processes not program context or products. It is possible that a combined measure of uncertainty would strengthen the somewhat low scale reliability, and perhaps yield the predicted results. In fact, given the low reliability of the uncertainty scale, the results on usefulness of analytic sources might even be stronger than shown in this analysis.

It is also possible that the effects of uncertainty on information need cannot be validly measured with self-administered questionnaires. The survey reported here was part of a triangulated design in which naturalistic methods were used to address many of the same issues. The comparative findings of these two approaches suggests that naturalistic methods capture those aspects of information need that are more difficult to articulate (Green & McClintock, in press). Given that questions about program uncertainty by definition probe ambiguous issues, it is likely that the questionnaire measures of uncertainty did not validly assess this construct.

Conclusions

Several major conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, it is clear that administrators have highly varied perceptions of the usefulness of different information sources. Most research on information needs assessment has not distinguished the usefulness of different information sources for varied decision tasks. Though it is commonly understood that administrators prefer verbal information, this study has shown that this preference depends on the task at hand. Verbal-internal information may be seen as more useful for instrumental use, such as the day-to-day administrative decisions about

allocating program resources and monitoring implementation. But under circumstances of public visibility and accountability pressures, such as judging client need and program effectiveness, administrators appear to find significant conceptual or symbolic use for analytic information.

Designing information systems to be responsive to this variability in need and use for information is still at a primitive stage. Promising leads may be found in the methods used for decision oriented program assessments (Hendricks, 1981), and graphic portrayals of verbal program descriptions (Trochim, in press). Each of these approaches attempts to integrate verbal and analytic information that can be used by decision makers for instrumental, conceptual or symbolic purposes. Still, there are too few exemplars of system design in which information from sources with offsetting biases are triangulated for the purpose of improving program decision making.

A second issue of significance that emerges from this study is the relatively low usefulness ratings for analytic sources on program input and process decision tasks. It is obvious that administrators do not see the value of analytic information for tasks such as resource allocation, program design and monitoring. It is not hard to see why since techniques such as cost analysis (Levin, 1983) can be expensive to use and difficult to comprehend in the hectic pace of managerial life. And, while the promise of computer-based decision support systems for program monitoring has been around for some time (Keen & Morton, 1978), its realization in practice has proved difficult to achieve.

The problem is probably not that administrators do not need analytic information for use in program design and monitoring, but that such information is too costly or unwieldly. Future research on this topic might examine the ways in which analytic and verbal information could be linked more effectively,

so that the user could make use of the contrasting strengths of each source. In addition to the methods mentioned earlier, Bayesian statistical procedures offer a promising approach to relating quantitative and qualitative information (Edwards et al., 1975). Though the statistical reasoning of Bayesian methods would be obscure for the average administrator, there are workable techniques for implementing the method that could serve as a useful basis for linking the intuitive verbal with the logical analytic information source.

An important issue that was not addressed in this study has to do with how use of different information sources relates to program effectiveness. The ultimate purpose of improving utilization is to improve program quality. There is virtually no research that seriously addresses this issue, though it is clearly of major significance. Respondents in this study made numerous comments on their questionnaires reflecting an assumption that there was a connection between improved utilization of information in program development decisions and program quality. The nature of this connection needs to be thoroughly explored.


Information management is a complex process that reflects the influence of many technical and social psychological processes on information need. The emphasis in this study on the contextual aspects of information should not be misinterpreted as downplaying information content. Complete assessments of information need require attention to the content and meaning of information as well as contextual factors such as source, decision task, accountability demands and program uncertainty. Anticipating the effects of context on information need will make the institutional researcher a more sophisticated collaborator with administrators in managing information in higher education.

Notes

¹Non-administrator respondent groups were also surveyed in the same study but are not included in this analysis. The agency studied was Cornell Cooperative Extension. For a more complete description of methodology and findings, write to the author for the project final report.

²Complete details on scale reliabilities are available from the author. Except for uncertainty, scales achieved reliability levels of .62 or higher using Cronbach's Alpha.

Figure 1. Mean Usefulness of Information Source by Decision Task




BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1. Average Usefulness of Information Sources Across Decision Tasks

	Verbal Internal	Verbal External	Analytic
1. Overall usefulness*	3.7	3.5	3.3
2. By Decision Task	F=58.9 df (3,105) p<.001	F=96.0 df (3,95) p<.001	F=44.3 df (3,84) p<.001
3. Predicted Comparisons By Decision Task*			
Context vs. Input	3.2-4.2	4.2-3.3	3.7-3.1
Context vs. Process	3.2-3.5	4.2-2.7	3.7-2.8
Product vs. Input	3.6-4.2	3.5-3.3	3.6-3.1
Product vs. Process	3.6-3.5	3.5-2.7	3.6-2.8

* All mean differences are significant at $p < .05$ using paired t-tests except for verbal internal information in the product vs. process decisions comparison.

Figure 2. Mean Usefulness of Analytic Information Source by Decision Task and Accountability



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2. Effects of Program Uncertainty on Mean Usefulness of Information Sources

Information Source	Uncertainty		t	p
	Uncertain	Certain		
Verbal Internal	3.5	3.8	1.88	n.s
Verbal External	3.4	3.5	1.18	n.s
Analytic	3.2	3.5	2.01	<.05

References

- Argyris, C. and Schon, D.A. Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
- Arrow, K.J. The limits of organization. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1974..
- Beyer, J.M. and Trice, H.M. The utilization process: A conceptual framework for synthesis of empirical findings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1982, 27, 591-622.
- Boyd, W.L. and Crowson, R. The changing conception and practice of public school administration. Review of Research in Education, Vol. 9, David C. Berlinger (Ed.)., 1981, 311-373.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 1-25.
- Daft, R.L. and Lengel, R.H. Information richness: A new approach to managerial behavior and organization design. Research in organizational behavior, 1984, 6, 191-233.
- Edwards, W., Guttentag, M., and Snapper, K. A decision- theoretic approach to evaluation research. In E.L. Streuning & M. Guttentag (Eds.). Handbook of evaluation research, Volume I, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Fincher, C.L. The politics of information. In J. W. Firnberg and W.F. Lasher (Eds.). The politics and pragmatics of institutional research, New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 38, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
- Feldman, M.S. and March, J.G. Information in organization as signal and symbol. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 71-186.
- Galbraith, J. Designing complex organizations. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1973.

- Greene, J., and McClintock, C. (in press). Triangulation in evaluation: Design and analysis issues. Evaluation Review.
- Henderson, J.G. and Nutt, P.C. On the design of planning information systems. Academy of Management Review, 1978, 774-785.
- Hendricks, M. Service delivery assessment: Qualitative evaluations at the cabinet level. In N.L. Smith (Ed.). Federal efforts to develop new evaluation methods. New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 12, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Keen, P.G.W., and Morton, M.S. Decision support systems: An organizational perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Levin, H.M. Cost effectiveness: A primer. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1983.
- Leviton, C.C. and Hughes, E.F. Research on the utilization of evaluation: A review and synthesis. Evaluation Review, 1981, 5, 525-548.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. Ambiguity and choice in organizations. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.
- Martin, W. and Willower, D.J. The managerial behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1981, 17, No. 3, 61-79.
- Maynard-Moody, S. and McClintock, C. Square pegs in round holes: Program evaluation and organizational uncertainty. Policy Studies Journal, 1981, 9, 644-666.
- McClintock, C. Toward a theory of formative evaluation. In D. Deshler (Ed.). Evaluation for program improvement. New Directions for Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.
- Mintzberg, H. The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- O'Reilly, C.A., III Variations in decision makers' use of information sources: The input of quality and accessibility of information. Academy of Management Journal, 1982, 25, 756-771.

- Stufflebeam, D.L. An introduction to the PDK book, Educational evaluations and decision-making. Excerpted in B.R. Worther and J.R. Sanders, Educational evaluation: Theory and practice. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones, 1973.
- Sproull, L.S. and Zubrow, D. Performance information in school systems: Perspectives from organizational theory. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1981, 17, 61-79.
- Tetlow, W.L. The pragmatic imperative of institutional research. In J.F. Fimberg and W.F. Lasher (Eds.). The politics and pragmatics of institutional research. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 38, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
- Trochim, W.M.K. (in press). Pattern matching, construct validity and conceptualization in program evaluation. Evaluation Review.
- Tushman, M.L. and Nadler, D.A. Information processing as an integrating concept in organizational design. Academy of management review, 1978, 3, 613-624.
- Weick, K. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 1-19.
- Weiss, C.H. The many meanings of research utilization. Public administration review, 1979, 39, 426-431.
- Whetten, D.A. Effective administrators: Good management on the college campus. Change, 1984, 38-43.